UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/810,703	03/16/2001	Kenneth P. Weiss	W0537/7006	7223

7590   05/19/2005

JOHN N. ANASTASI
C/O LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
ONE MAIN STREET
RIVERFRONT OFFICE PARK
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142

EXAMINER
DADA, BEEMNET W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/810,703	WEISS, KENNETH P.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Beemnet W. Dada	2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 January 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-43* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in reply to an amendment filed on January 13, 2005. Claims 10, 15-

21 have been amended, new claims 24-43 have been added. Claims 1-43 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed January 13, 2005 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

3.   Applicant argues that Rozen et al. does not teach an access mechanism which, for each

access request to a database, includes at least one of a coded indication of the entity

requesting the access and the status of such entity, and does not teach, in response to such

access request, determines from at least one of provided coded indication of entity and coded

indication of entity status whether the entity is entitled to access the requested data. Examiner

disagrees.

Examiner would point out that Rozen et al. teaches categorizing personal information

into a first and second category, and associating a first pin (PIN-1) or a second pin (PIN-2) with

the categorized personal information (see column 4, lines, 39-44), and a based on the **status of**

the requestor, Emergency PIN (E-PIN) or Confidential PIN (C-PIN) is provided to the

requestor to access categorized information, where he/she present during a request to access

participant's information (i.e. a **coded** indication of the **entity status** requesting the access (see

column 7, lines (column 4, lines 54-61 and column 7, lines 8-14)). Rozent et al. further teaches

that the requester uses identifier and password to access participant's information (i.e., coded

indication of entity (see column 4, lines 53-58)).

4.   Applicant argues that Rozen et al. does not teach a database from which a provider of

services can obtain a public code of an entity seeking such services. Examiner disagrees.

Examiner would point out that Rozen et al. teaches storing an identifier and password

with personal information in a data file (see for example, column 4, lines 47-50) and associating

the identifier and password with stored personal information for user access (column 7, lines 4-

14).

5.   Applicant argues that Rozen et al. does not teach a mechanism by which an

organization desiring access to data in the database of the secure registry system comprises a

processor which generates data request, including a form in which such data is to be provided,

and a response mechanism which, in response to such form, formats the collected data in that

form and sends the formatted data in that form. Applicant further argues that Rozen et al. does

not teach a contact mechanism by which an entity making a query to the secure registry system

can contact a matching individual only through the system, no contact information being

provided to the entity. Examiner disagrees.

Examiner asserts that Rozen et al. teaches a mechanism by which an organization

desiring access to data in said database may gain such access [column 7, lines 15-20], each

said organization having a processor (i.e., requesters computer, see column 5, lines 32-41)

which generates data requests, each such data request including a form in which such data is to

be provided (i.e., a form in which data is provided includes screen viewing, email and fax)

(column 7, lines 20-33, column 9, lines 47-64); and a response mechanism which collects data

required by said form for a given request, formats the collected data in said form, and sends the

formatted data to the organization generating the request (column 7, lines 47-53 and column 9,

lines 55-64). Rozen et al. further teaches a contact mechanism by which the entity making the

query can contact a matching individual only through the system, no contact information being

provided to the entity (i.e., the entity making the query gains access to biographical data of the

entity, through the system) [column 7, lines 47-53, and column 7, lines 17-33]. Examiner asserts

that Rozen et al. teaches the claimed limitations as recited in the claims. Therefore rejection is

maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
> another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
> granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
> applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
> 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
> only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
> of such treaty in the English language.

7.   Claims 1-8, 10-19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Rozen et al (hereinafter referred to as Rozen) (US Patent No. 6,073,106).

8.   As per claims 1 and 16, Rozen teaches a secure registry system including:

        a database containing selected data on each of a plurality of entities (i.e., categorized

personal information stored in a data file), a code (i.e., E-PIN and C-PIN) being stored with at

least selected portions of said data for at least selected said entities restricting access to said

selected portions to entities defined by each said code [column 4, lines 47-62];

        an identity mechanism which permits each entity to securely identify itself to the system

[column 4, lines 53-61];

an input mechanism which determines if an identified entity is authorized to enter data

into the database, and permits an authorized entity to enter data into the database [column 4,

lines 57-67 and column 6, lines 1-11];

an access mechanism which permits access requests to be made to said database

[column 7, lines 15-20], each such request including an indication of data requested and at least

one of a coded indication of the entity requesting the access and the status of such entity

[column 7, lines 20-37]; and

an entitlement mechanism, including at least in part said identity mechanism, which

determines from at least one of provided coded indication of entity and coded indication of entity

status whether the entity is entitled to access the requested data, the mechanism granting

access to the requested data if the entity is entitled and denying access if the entity is not

entitled [column 4, lines 47-65 and column 7, lines 15-37].

9.   As per claims 10 and 21, Rozen teaches a secure registry system for entities, each of

which is identified by a multi-character public code, the system including:

a database from which the public code for each entity may be obtained [column 4, lines

47-62]; and

a processor at a provider of services for entities (i.e., a service provider's server, see

column 5, lines 32-41), said processor including a mechanism for mapping each received public

code to data required by the provider in order to provide the services [column 7, lines 4-17],

receiving the public code for an entity on whose behalf services are to be provided and using

the corresponding mapped data to perform the services [column 4, lines 47-65 and column 7,

lines 15-37].

10.   As per claim 13, Rozen teaches a secure registry system including:

a database containing selected data on each of a plurality of entities [column 4, lines 47-

62];

a mechanism by which an organization desiring access to data in said database may

gain such access [column 7, lines 15-20], each said organization having a processor (i.e.,

requesters computer, see column 5, lines 32-41) which generates data requests, each such

data request including a form in which such data is to be provided (i.e., a form in which data is

provided includes screen viewing, email and fax) [column 7, lines 20-33, column 9, lines 47-64];

and

a response mechanism which collects data required by said form for a given request,

formats the collected data in said form, and sends the formatted data to the organization

generating the request [column 7, lines 47-53 and column 9, lines 55-64].

11.   As per claim 14, Rozen teaches a secure registry system including:

a database containing biographical data (i.e., personal information) on a plurality of

individuals[column 4, lines 47-62];

a query mechanism by which an entity trying to find an individual can input to the system

a query containing selected biographical data on the individual [column 7, lines 47-53 and

column 7, lines 17-23];

a response mechanism (i.e., screen viewing, fax or email) operative in response to a

query for providing to the entity selected information on individuals in the system matching the

query biological information [column 7, lines 47-53, and column 7, lines 17-33]; and

a contact mechanism by which the entity making the query can contact a matching

individual only through the system, no contact information being provided to the entity (i.e., the

entity making the query gains access to biographical data of the entity, through the system) [column 7, lines 47-53, and column 7, lines 17-33].

12.   As per claim 15, Rozen teaches a storage media containing machine readable code which facilitates communication between a remote machine running the code and a secure registry system of a type (i.e., communication between a requesting computer and a service provider's server via a web site, see column 5, lines 31-47) having a database containing selected data on each of a plurality of entities and restricted access to at least portions of such data [column 4, lines 47-62], the code causing access requests from the machine to the system to each automatically include at least a status code for the machine [column 7, lines 47-53 and column 7, lines 17-23] and a format in which data requested is to be presented for response (i.e., a form in which data is provided includes screen viewing, email and fax) [column 7, lines 20-33, column 9, lines 47-64], the secure registry system recognizing the status code to control access to data in the database based on the status code and using the format to select the data to be accessed and to control the format in which accessed data is returned to the machine [column 7, lines 47-53, and column 7, lines 17-33].

13.   As per claims 2 and 17, Rozen teaches the system as applied above. Furthermore, Rozen teaches the system, wherein said input mechanism includes a restriction mechanism which permits entities to identify portions of the data relating to them for which there is to be restricted access and to store the appropriate code with each such portion, said restriction mechanism including a change mechanism for permitting an entity identified by said identity mechanism to change entities to whom access is granted for at least selected portions of the data for the entity [column 7, lines 4-23].

14.   As per claims 3 and 18, Rozen teaches the system as applied above. Furthermore,

Rozen teaches wherein each entity has a code regimen by which it can be identified by said

identity mechanism and a distress code regimen which the entity may employ when making at

least one of entries and changes in the database to indicate that such is being done under

duress, and a protection mechanism operative in response to receipt of a distress code regimen

for initiating appropriate action for the protection of the entity [column 7, lines 17-37].

15.   As per claims 4 and 19, Rozen teaches the system as applied above. Furthermore,

Rozen teaches the system, wherein said entitlement mechanism releases selected portions of

data for entities to at least selected classes of data requesters based only on the coded status

of such entity [column 7, lines 48-53].

16.   As per claim 5, Rozen teaches the system as applied above. Furthermore, Rozen

teaches the system, wherein at least selected data requesting entities have a mechanism

included in their processors which automatically adds their status code to each data request

sent by the entity to the system [column 7, lines 48-53].

17.   As per claim 6, Rozen teaches the system as applied above. Furthermore, Rozen

teaches the system, wherein at least selected data requesting entities have a mechanism

included in their processors which provides a format for requested data (i.e., a form in which

data is provided includes screen viewing, email and fax) [column 7, lines 20-33, column 9, lines

47-64]; and wherein said system includes a mechanism which accumulates data required to

respond to a request in said format and responds to the request with the collected data presented in said format [column 7, lines 47-53 and column 9, lines 55-64].

18.   As per claim 7, Rozen teaches the system as applied above. Furthermore, Rozen teaches the system, wherein said coded indication and coded status for an entity are selectively merged into a single coded input to the system for an access requesting entity, the system including a mechanism for determining the coded status and coded indication from the single coded input [column 7, lines 4-14].

19.   As per claim 8, Rozen teaches the system as applied above. Furthermore, Rozen teaches the system, wherein an entity requesting data has a mechanism included in their processor which automatically includes with at least selected data requests a coded status indication and a form into which requested information is to be provided [column 7, lines 20-33, column 9, lines 47-64]; and wherein said entitlement mechanism provides information from the database to which the entity is entitled in the form provided by the entity [column 7, lines 47-53 and column 9, lines 55-64].

20.   As per claims 11 and 22, Rozen teaches the system as applied above. Furthermore, Rozen teaches the system wherein said provider provides delivery services, the mapped data being an address to which item are to be delivered for the entity, the provider receiving an item to be delivered and a public code for the recipient, and using the public code to obtain the appropriate address for delivery of the item [column 7, lines 65-67 and column 8, lines 1-12].

21.   As per claims 12 and 23, Rozen teaches the system as applied above. Furthermore,

Rozen teaches the system wherein said provider provides telephone service, the mapped data

being a current telephone number for the entity, the provider receiving the public code and

connecting the party providing the code to the current telephone number of the entity [column 9,

lines 47-64].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

22.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

23.   Claims 9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozen

(US Patent No. 6,073,106).

24.   As per claims 9 and 20 Rozen teaches a secure registry system as applied to claims 1

and 16 above. Furthermore, Rozen teaches a database containing selected data on each of a

plurality of entities (i.e., categorized personal information stored in a data file), a code (i.e., E-

PIN and C-PIN) being stored with at least selected portions of said data for at least selected

said entities restricting access to said selected portions to entities defined by each said code

[column 4, lines 47-62]; and an entitlement mechanism, including at least in part said identity

mechanism, which determines from at least one of provided coded indication of entity and

coded indication of entity status whether the entity is entitled to access the requested data, the

mechanism granting access to the requested data if the entity is entitled and denying access if

the entity is not entitled [column 4, lines 47-65 and column 7, lines 15-37]. Further Rozen

suggests storing personal information in additional storage such as smart cards [column 2, lines

39-67, column 4, lines 1-5]. However, Rozen fails to explicitly teach storing data in additional

database outside the system. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made incorporate a method of storing relevant data in additional

database outside the system in Rozen. It would have been obvious because Rozen suggests

storing personal information in additional storage such as smart cards [column 2, lines 39-67,

column 4, lines 1-5]. Based on this suggestion it would have been obvious to store relevant data

in additional database outside the system in order to store personal information in multiple

location.

25.   Claims 24-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rozen

(US Patent No. 6,073,106) in view of Bernstein US Patent 5,915,023.

26.   As per claims 24-43, Rozen teaches the method/system as applied above. Rozen is

silent on the act of mapping received public code and using the mapped data to perform

services comprises receiving credit card information about the entity to perform the services,

wherein the act of mapped data comprises receiving a validation or denial of the credit card

transaction without actually receiving the credit card number of the entity. However Bernstein

teaches an automatic account controller for remotely arranging for transfer of value (see

abstract) including an identification information comprises personal information (for example,

email address, telephone number) [column 4, lines 3-9], further comprising of mapping received

public code and using the mapped data to perform services comprises receiving credit card

information about the entity to perform the services, wherein the act of mapped data comprises

receiving a validation or denial of the credit card transaction without actually receiving the credit card number of the entity [column 6, lines 34-59 and column 7, lines 46-67]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Bernstein within the system of Rozen in order to enhance security of the system.

Conclusion

27.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beemnet W. Dada whose telephone number is (571) 272-3847. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (9:00 am - 5:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Beemnet Dada

May 11, 2005

AU 2135